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Abstract

Every citizen will always be in touch with bureaucratic activities by government administration. Even when a person is still in his/her mother's womb he/she has begun to depend on bureaucratic service. Thus, theoretically and practically, the quality of management and professionalism of public services should be more oriented towards the goals of government paradigms based on new management approaches, so the spirit of government in building clean and good governance can be achieved. The purpose if this article is to explore the phenomenon of bureaucratic pathology in government administration. Method used in this article was content analysis, one of the research approaches in qualitative research. Data were originated from the writer's reading of various theories, expert opinions and previous research results related to bureaucratic pathology. Data was analysis by selecting and reducing, presenting, interpreting and go to the conclusions. This article is concluded that bureaucratic pathology can be solved by implementation of good governance principles at government administration at central, provincial, and local level government in Indonesia.
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I. Introduction

In medical context can be found the term pathology has the meaning of disease. The term of pathology formerly exists only in medical terms, however, nowadays is also used in the world of bureaucracy when it refers to various scientific articles by bureaucratic researchers (Grindle, 2004). With the term pathology in bureaucracy is certainly raises a big question, where and why the term appears? In general, the term pathology arises because of the disease in the bureaucracy organized by the government apparatus, whether related to the political, economic, social cultural or technological (Dwiyanto, 2011).

Based on the author's analysis, bureaucratic disease that called bureaucratic pathology arises due to the result of interaction between wrong bureaucratic structure and supported by wrong environmental variables. In other words, bureaucratic pathology arises because the relationship between variables in bureaucratic structure is too excessive, such as long hierarchy chain, specialization, formalization and bureaucratic performance that is not linear. According Siagian (1994) bureaucratic pathology can be identified to five categories namely, the pathology arising from perceptions and managerial style of officials in the bureaucratic environment, the pathology caused by the lack or low knowledge and skilled operators implementing various operational activities, the pathology arising from the action of bureaucratic apparatus in violation of applicable legal and regulatory norms, the pathologies manifested in the behavior of bureaucrats who are dysfunctional or negative, and the pathology that is the result of internal situation in various institutions within the governmental environment.

The five categories of bureaucratic pathologies as the authors pointed out above, are becoming increasingly chronic when other bureaucratic tumors also adorn the performance of bureaucracy resulting in proliferation and dual structure, non-transparency of accountability ignited the birth of manipulation and corruption, patronage applications in employee recruitment fertilize nepotism and bribery, and the practice of maladministration and other mismanagement (Lukow, 2013).

The emergence of bureaucratic pathological phenomenon is finally continued and ingrained in bureaucracy corps, the phenomenon has even undermined almost all lines of bureaucracy both organized by government and private organizations. In fact, in the realm of government-run bureaucracy, there has been tools or instruments of supervision (internal control system) made that deviate bureaucratic acts is less more chronic, but the fact is that the system is still far from expectations, because public or society considers the product of bureaucratic service is no longer their right that can easily be obtained, the public have seen the bureaucracy as something that must be accessed with certain connections, just like market law mechanisms. Thus the provision that the bureaucracy has an obligation to serve the community to be turned back because society is to be smart to serve the bureaucratic will. Departing from the facts and culture is then facilitate the occurrence of collusion phenomena, illegal levies and licensors perceived by the community identical with the bureaucracy itself. Strictly speaking, the bureaucracy in this country increasingly shows less good performance (Olsen, 2006; Dwiyanto, 2011).

Whereas public services, both public goods or public services in principle
responsibility of public administration in this case the central government, the region to the lowest level of government like the village. Public service activities should be carried out in order to meet the needs of the community or the implementation of the provisions of legislation.

It is reasonable that a bureaucrat or public apparatus deserves to be dubbed civil servants, because on their social, governmental and developmental duties are held on behalf of the great super-political organization called the state (Kirwan 1987, Carino 1992). But it is important to remember that the legitimacy received by the civil servants come from the sovereign people's trust. That is, a civil servant is someone who carries the mandate of the people to protect the interests of the people themselves. So, in relation to this source of legitimacy, then a public apparatus (public servant, bureaucrat or civil servant) is, in fact, a public servant. This means that the task of the public apparatus is to serve the public interest.

Indeed, related to the code of ethics sapta prasetya, bureaucrats are required to behave cleanly, commitment, strong character with a high work ethic, authoritative so as to maintain the good name of his/her corps. Because fragile character easily plunges a person into actions that put harm to people around him/her, character education today becomes very urgent in order to educate the whole and plenary Indonesian community (Murniyetti, Engkizar and Anwar, 2016). In spite of the fact today, the bureaucracy is only an extension of the government's hand to be served by the public. It seems that government officials want to make profit out of bureaucracy. A reverse logic, should the bureaucracy be tools to serve the community with various forms of government-generated policy. It is not surprising, therefore, that Surbakti & Mashad (1998) argue that the great authority of the bureaucrat in Indonesia has almost touched all aspects of people's lives. The overwhelming authority ultimately emphasizes the role of the bureaucracy as if making policy not as implementing policy, more dominant than serving the community. Finally, it is natural that bureaucracy is more regarded as a source of problems and burdens for society, not the opposite source of solutions for problems faced by society.

II. Method

The method that used in writing this articles is content analysis, one of the research approaches in qualitative research. The data comes from the reading material of various theories, expert opinions, and previous research results related to bureaucratic pathology. All obtained from various theories, research results and expert opinions are then analyzed thematically. Thematic analysis is one of the more flexible way of identifying, analyzing, and reporting qualitative research data (Braun & Clarke, 2012: 23-31).

III. RESULT AND DISCUSSION

1) Bureaucracy

According to Bovaird (2004) bureaucracy is an important instrument in modern society whose presence is inevitable. The existence of this bureaucracy as a logical consequence of the main task of the state (government) to organize social welfare. States are required to be involved to provide goods and services required by their people (public goods and services) either directly or indirectly. Even in certain circumstances the state should decide what
is the best for the people. For that the state must build an administrative system aiming to serve the interests of its people called by the term bureaucracy (Denhardt & Denhardt, 2000). In this section the authors will describe the three views of experts related to bureaucratic theories, the three experts are Max Weber, Karl Marx and Hegel.

The First is the view of Max Weber (1983), a great German sociologist, whose thinking about bureaucracy has become very classical in academic literature. Bureaucracy is understood as organizing principles rather than certain exclusive institutions such as government services as understood by ordinary people in this country. Weber used the term bureaucratization to explain the widespread application of bureaucratic principles in modern organizations and institutions.

In detail Weber (1983) explains the characteristics ideal of bureaucracy such as ; i) power held by the office and not occupation, ii) authority is established through organizational rules, iii) impersonal organizational action, involving execution of public policy, iv) organizational action is framed with a disciplined system of knowledge, v) a formally codified rule, vi) precedent and abstract rules being the standard for organizational action; vii) specialization; viii) the firm definition of bureaucratic action with particular action determines the legitimacy of action, ix) the functional separation of the tasks followed by the structure of formal authority, x) power delegated via hierarchy, xi) power delegation expressed in terms of duties, rights, obligations and responsibilities established by contract, xii) the qualities required for filling positions measured by formal credential recognition (diplomas, certificates, etc.), xiii) career structure and promotion, both on the basis of seniority and achievement, xvi) different positions in the hierarchy will receive different payments; and xv) centralized coordination, communication, and control (Weber, 1983).

It is worth noting that in Weber's catalog list of rational bureaucratic characteristics as described above is defined as an ideal type. The ideal type is better understood as a conceptual framework that views bureaucracy in its pure form, which is indifferent to the distinctive aspects of real bureaucracies. The ideal bureaucratization itself in its history has never been manifestly realized, so no empirical organization is wholly similar to Weber's ideal type. So this ideal type is actually intended as a guide for empirical research. The more attribute of rational bureaucracy within an organization, the organization can be said to be more bureaucratic and more efficient (Grindle, 2004).

Weber also has an ambivalent view of bureaucracy and bureaucratisation. On the one hand, he said that bureaucracy is the most efficient organization ever created in human history. On the other hand, Weber is also concerned about the widespread pathology in line with the massive growth of bureaucratization. Alvin Gouldner said that Weber's bureaucratic theory has created the metaphysical pathos that modern humans are condemned to live together with the bureaucracy. Although bureaucracy dehumanized human life, Weber also saw bureaucracy as the only possible way to organize in the context of modern society. Modern human relationships with bureaucracy are like the relationship between the sons of Adam and original sin. Bureaucracy is hated but inevitable, even it is its presence that gives it identity as a modern man.
Second is the bureaucratic opinion expressed by Karl Marx. Marx thought bureaucracy forever reflects only the particular interests of the dominant class in society. In his perspective, bureaucracy is like an instrument controlled and run by the ruling class to secure its interests. The justification and existence of the bureaucracy is entirely up to the ruling class. When the bureaucracy claims to have represented the universal interests of society, it is nothing but an ideological veil that attempts to obscure its essence as a servant of ruling class domination (Grindle, 2004, Bahari, 2012).

From class perspective, bureaucrats occupy an ambiguous position. On the one hand, they are not part of any social class because of its non-organic position, which is not directly related to the process of production, where it is this process of production that constitutively defines a strict class identity: or bourgeois or proletariat. On the other hand, such a position places them in a relatively autonomous position, so that conflicts with their owners (the bourgeoisie) are possible, although the conflict can not, however, pass certain limits determined by the relationship of production and the forces of production.

Bureaucracy is also an entity has an important role in the process of alienation, a concept quite central to Marx's thinking. In the process of alienation a social force shy away from human directional control so that the force becomes independent and turns against the human creator. Similarly, what happens in bureaucratic work operations in the modern world. The bureaucracy becomes an autonomous and oppressive power that the public perceives as a mysterious, foreign, and distant entity (Goodsell, 2003; Basuki, 2008). Although everyday bureaucracy regulates human life, but human beings themselves are unable to control and understand it clearly. In Marx's terms, bureaucracy is a magical circle that no one can escape from it. Secrecy becomes universal spirit. This bureaucratic alienation is further strengthened by the attitude of bureaucrats who create certain myths and symbols that sanctify and mystify their position.

Alienation of bureaucracy is not only between bureaucrats and the public, but also found within the bureaucracy itself. Often bureaucrats are unaware of the parasitic and oppressive nature of their work. They think that they are contributing to the achievement of the common good. This ideological illusion is consolidated through rigid hierarchy and discipline as well as through worship of authority.

Marx did see the bureaucracy very cynically. For him, the bureaucracy is always filled with a variety of acute pathologies. In addition to being incompetent, most bureaucrats are also lack of initiative and imagination, afraid to take responsibility. Hence the power to be fast and precise in taking action, the existence of a high self-efficacy must be owned by a bureaucrat. Because the ability to maintain and nurture self-efficacy will bring a sense of self confidence to a person in completing the tasks performed (Damri, Engkizar & Anwar, 2017). Therefore, cultures such as feeling self-possessed capacity to do everything must be avoided. That is one aspect of what Marx calls 'bureaucratic materialism of bureaucracy', as well as liturgy for promotion, childish attachment to symbols of purity, status, and prestige (Denhardt & Denhardt 2000).

Third, is Hegel's view. According to Hegel, bureaucracy is understood in the
context of "Sittlichkeit" which can be translated as a socio-moral order, as a supreme stage of social life. In Philosophy of Right, Hegel said that society as sittlichheit can be divided into three levels or ethical substance, ie family, civil society, and state. Bureaucracy is part of the state playing a role in mediating the particular interests of civil society with the universal interests of the state. In other words, bureaucracy is a bridge between the state and civil society (Beiser, 2005).

Meanwhile, the main function of the bureaucracy is mediating the interests of civil society with the interests of the state. Bureaucracy plays a crucial role in the overall socio-political system because its counsel is capable of binding the state. Normatively, the law is made by legislative body composed of representatives of civil society. However, for Hegel the bureaucracy is believed to have the ability to know the authentic interests of civil society. Hegel actually doubts the ability of the people to collectively-rationally explore and discover what is actually in their common interest. In dialectical logic, civil society and its representatives are postulated to be capable of only articulating particular interests while bureaucrats capable of articulating the universal interest in the sense of the common good (bonum commune) (Beiser, 2005).

From the various opinions and views of experts above the authors can conclude that bureaucracy can be understood as a system of work applicable in organizations that regulate social interaction both in and out. Specifically the public bureaucracy (government) can be interpreted as an institution or government agency equipped with systematic and rational authority with the rules of the straightforward.

b. Bureaucratic Pathology.

The bureaucratic pathology or bureaucratic disease is the result of interaction between the wrong bureaucratic structure and wrong environmental variables (Carino, 1992; Dwiyanto, 2011). While Olsen (2006) and Risman (2002) define the bureaucratic pathology is a disease or a form of bureaucratic behavior that deviates from ethical values, rules and rules of law, and norms prevailing in the bureaucracy.

Pathological bureaucratic behavior is not a stand alone thing, but is the result of interaction between various aspects, such as aspects of bureaucracy and individual aspects that exist in the environment. Individual aspects lead to bureaucratic order, ability, personal belief, expectation, needs, and other mass experiences (Siagian, 1994). These are individual characteristics, whereas the characteristics of the bureaucracy consist of hierarchical structure, the division of labor, the existence of tasks in certain positions, the existence of authority and responsibility, the existence of a particular payroll system, the existence of control systems. If the characteristics of the individuals proposed interact with bureaucratic characteristics, then the bureaucratic behavior arises.

According to Carino (1992) and Siagian (1994) the pathology is divided into five categories: First, the paternalistic, the superior is like a king that must be obeyed and respected, treated special, no strict control, and subordinate employees have no determination to criticize what has boss been done. It makes public services less than the maximum due to overly subordinate attitudes toward superiors that bureaucracy tends to ignore what is in the public interest as citizens who are obliged to receive the
best service possible. Second, budget swelling, there are several reasons why this often happens: the greater the budget allocated for activities the greater the opportunity to mark up the budget, the absence of clarity between costs and revenues in the public bureaucracy, tradition of cutting the budget proposed in the budget planning process so as to bring initiatives to people who propose the budget to exaggerate the budget, and tendency of bureaucracy to allocate the budget on the basis of input. The budget swelling will be widespread when the power of civil society is weak in controlling the government.

Third, the excessive procedures will result in convoluted and less favorable services for the community when in urgent circumstances. Fourth, bureaucratic swelling, can be done by increasing structures on bureaucracy with reason to lighten the workload and others that the structure is not really necessary existence. Due to the many funds of the state budget (State Budget) issued by the government that can indirectly harm the state. So that the budget becomes less precise target and Fifth, bureaucracy fragmentation, the number of new ministries made by government more often is not based on a need to respond to the interests of society but more to certain motives.

Meanwhile, according to Olsen (2006) Dwiyanto (2011) some of the most common bureaucratic pathology encountered amid the practice of governance is as shown in Figure 1.1 below:

Figure: 1. The practice of bureaucratic pathology in governance

The practice of bureaucratic pathology is complex, it has relevance with various organizational aspects, both in terms of structure and culture. Pathological forms and their causes can be fundamentally identifiable, but therapy or solutions to overcome them is not an easy task. This is similar to that experienced in Indonesia, where bureaucracy reform has long been done by the government, but until now the bureaucratic system has not been able to overcome various problems encountered. So the greatest challenge facing the bureaucracy is how they are able to carry out the activities efficiently and effectively, because so far the bureaucracy has been identified with the convoluted performance, the overly large structure, full of collusion, corruption and nepotism, and no definite standards. A number of bureaucratic pathologies become a significant obstacle in the realization of services that satisfies the community. It is on this basis that the Indonesian bureaucracy is very far from what is called good governance.
c. Implementation of Good Governance as Solution to Bureaucratic Pathology

Given the many diseases attached to the bureaucracy, it is necessary to have a response to improve the bureaucracy to be better, quicker and responsive to what is in the interest of the community (Beiser, 2005; Basuki, 2008). According to the authors, some things that need to be done in order to overcome bureaucratic diseases is to develop holistic (holistic) bureaucracy development policy in order to be able to touch all dimensions of the system, such as bureaucracy based on information and communication technology such as e-government, e-procurement to facilitate interaction between communities with service providers. However, the technology-based system still needs to be monitored and guarded related to its implementation in order to minimize the occurrence of bureaucratic fraud (Weber, 1983; Surbakti & Mashad, 1998). Next is the structure, culture, government bureaucracy, develop a democratic political system and is able to control the running of the government with the intention that the government be more transparent and accountable (Maritime, 2012).

According to the authors, some alternative pathology problem solving in bureaucratic bodies in building efficient, responsive, accountable and transparent public services required to established policies guiding the behavior of government bureaucracy apparatus. The alternatives are as follows:

1. **Participation.** Through this principle people will be involved in making decisions built on the basis of freedom of association and speak and participate constructively, so that the government does not become authoritative in making decisions. The resulting decision is a representation of the wishes of the community and can not be intervened by the parties who want to take advantage of the government.

2. **Rule of law.** The rule of law is a step that must be taken to minimize or eliminate pathological practices in the bureaucracy. With good law enforcement then the indication of wrongdoing will be erased because bureaucrats will be afraid of the threat of the law.

3. **Transparency.** Through the principle of transparency, everything done by the government or bureaucrats can be controlled by the public through open and accessible information. This transparency encourages the bureaucracy to always run the rules in accordance with the provisions and legislation, because if not appropriate the community must know and prosecute.

4. **Responsiveness.** The new paradigm of bureaucracy emphasizes that government should be able to serve the needs of the general public and respond to the demands of development. The pathology that has been happening where the government is served by the community, then with the principle of responsiveness of the government should as far as possible provide services to stakeholders.

5. **Accountability.** Through accountability to the public bureaucracy becomes cautious in acting, with public accountability the
government must provide precise and clear information about its overall performance.

6. **Strategic vision.** Through vision strategy it will grow in every bureaucrat for the future. These values and expectations will give an impression practice of bureaucratic work.

According to Marta (2004) good governance exists if power sharing exists. So there is disperse of power instead of concentrate of power. Good governance is similar to disperse of power, power sharing plus public accountability plus transparency. So if there is no such principle, good governance needs to suppress the abuse of power or authority that usually leads to corruption. And corrupt it always abuse of power. The higher the quality of good governance, the lower the corruption. Conversely, the lower the quality of good governance, the higher the corruption. From the above statement clearly illustrates how the principles of good governance can prevent bureaucratic pathology, especially in terms of corruption, collusion, nepotism.

**IV. Conclusion**

The development of apparatus resources is not the only way to get out of the bureaucratic crisis. But as efforts of course there are results, at least there is a bit of enlightenment in the overall development of the quality of bureaucracy or government apparatus, but must still be improved continuously in order to create bureaucratic figure or professional and character apparatus. With the efforts as mentioned in the above discussion is expected to realize good governance and enhance professionalism of bureaucracy through the change of paradigm, behavior oriented prime service to the public. It can be concluded that the implementation of good governance principles can solve the problem of bureaucratic pathology especially corruption, collusion, and nepotism.

**References:**


